

W H m

ART Notes June 2, 1998

Dale Flowers gave overview of meeting purpose and format.

Purpose:

- to identify issues
- develop framework
- identify next steps
- not a problem-solving meeting

Format:

One hour per topic. Program manager will review issues lists, group will add significant agency issues (critical show-stoppers), and any changes to time, etc.

Wendy reviewed matrix.

- "When" refers to deadlines for decisions: Preferred alternative indicates the decision is needed before the revised draft; Final means the decision is not needed for selection of the preferred alternative or for the revised draft, but must be made before the final; Phase III means decision can be made in staged implementation.
- "Elevate" identifies policy issues that must be resolved at CALFED Management Team or Policy Group level.
- "Type" refers to type of decision process. Decision means a simple yes or no; Process means we need to develop a decision-making process.

Water Use Efficiency Issues - Rick Soehren

WUE #1

Earl: "least cost economic analysis" -- should be "most effective" not necessarily cheapest.

Soehren: Benefits-cost ratio is how I've looked at it.

Penny: Demand management - what is the definition? This isn't quite catching the issue.

Carolyn: Demand reduction, least cost

Earl: capture relationships

Breitenbach: make the first sentence one item.

Penny: what will be effects? Equivalency analysis Carolyn brought up needs to be added.

ACTION: Soehren to revise and bring back to ART.

Steve: So Mark Cowin's doesn't include demand management.

Mark: Wouldn't say that.

Steve: Land retirement not part of demand management

Mark: That's not our mission (to retire land), but could be result.

Earl: Land retirement needs to be defined.

Mark: Two-part approach to economic evaluation of water management alternatives. Got experts together to discuss how to set up models, identify tools - develop consensus on relationships.

Very complex, emotional.

Longer-term -- not expecting to get information to Policy Group this year. But working on it.

Shorter-term equivalency analysis assumes scenarios and plugs into existing economic models re distribution.

Steve: not comparing storage vs demand management.

Patrick Leonard: want program managers to spend more time on workplan efforts. Where's the expert team? Stakeholders will see this as rationalization of decision already made.

Wendy: Issues that need further discussion should be held over to a subsequent meeting. On the team, there are others who need to be involved, let's get some names.

Names suggested: Ray Hoagland, DWR; Earl Nelson, WAPA; Hoffman, USBR

Penny: Water management strategy work team for second piece of this issue

Mark: new workplan - just had first meeting last week. At last Management Team meeting, made invitation to the meeting on 5/29. Want to have better representation at 6/9 meeting (10 a.m.).

Earl: Credibility question -- Do we need to bring in nationally recognized experts?

Patrick: Yes. Not tied to historic views. We see issue but we can't really help.

Soehren: We are addressing. If at end of my eight issues you aren't satisfied, bring this up again.

Mark: UC staff helping us with workplan

Soehren: Expert panel is being considered.

WUE #2

Kathy: Does this capture efficiencies by local agencies?

Soehren: No.

Carolyn: Incorporate your verbal comments into this written issue.

Soehren: There is more information in the WUE appendix.

Penny: Disagree with Carolyn.

Kathy: Want a DWR Planning rep added to team -- will provide name.

Tom Howard: Will this include definition of WUE?

Soehren: No, that's in appendix.

Patrick: Don't wait for us to volunteer to participate. Ask us if you need help.

Group OK with characterization of WUE#2

WUE #3

Breitenbach: Next draft has to speak to these issues, even if only to say that we're working on it.

Kathy: Include in revised summary to allow public to comment on certification process.

Greg Young asked process question regarding "decision."

Wendy: When we say "decision," the issue will be addressed in revised draft.

Greg: What does PA mean on this schedule? By August when Policy Group makes decision on PA, or December when we do Revised Draft?

Wendy: Closely linked, but PA = this fall, Final = next fall.

Group OK with characterization of WUE #3.

WUE #4

Penny: Issue - is Structure vs. Voluntary. Change "regulatory" to "structured."

Earl: Not comfortable with taking "regulatory" out.

Penny: Elevate to Policy.

When = preferred alternative.

Soehren: CALFED agencies are reluctant to deal with this - needs to be elevated.
ACTION: Penny to write up with help from Steve, Carolyn, DWR Rep, Tom Howard, and Soehren. Kathy recommended including comments from each agency. Writing up issue, perspectives, options, not recommendations. Two-pages for next Management Team meeting. Need by COB next Friday.

WUE #5

Soehren: Looking at prospect of expert panel. List of questions for panel, and recommendations for panel members.

Issue revisions:

Steve: Council more linked to direct demand management - issue #1.

Carolyn: EPA issues about analysis - more analytical, less policy. Reexamine benefit/cost of conservation. Pacific Institute will have meaty comments, we need to review their info.

Characterization of issue OK.

Steve on workplan -- Workplan text of #3 fits #5

Soehren: Expert panel would help satisfy stakeholders and try to build consensus.

Steve: optimistic that council will make progress in elevating credibility before Final.

Kathy: Combine issues #3 and #5 as one. Workplan efforts should be same.

When: OK

Type: OK

Kathy: Expert panel - if you put that somewhere else, these two could be easily combined.

Penny: not separate issue, relates to #4

Steve: Expert panel fits into #1

Soehren: fits in with lack of consensus with Council.

Focus group can hash out questions for panel.

ACTION: Soehren to bring back reworked matrix.

Soehren: higher level of consensus with urban council than ag council.

Tom: Refine certification process for urban

Soehren: Not problematic -- stakeholders working together.

Wendy: Soehren needs to recharacterize issues, shifting of workplan efforts.

Penny: If Policy Group directs ... incentive market approach. If more structured process, different approach.

Should elevate to Policy Group.

WUE #6

Soehren: Some kind of decision needed by Revised draft, even if not to decide.

ACTION: Need to revisit after seeing comments.

WUE #7

Patrick: Shouldn't be characterized as a conclusion but as a question/issue.

Wendy: Issue is financing.

Penny: Goes back to #4

Wendy: We'll get into workplans at subsequent weekly meeting.

ACTION: Soehren to recraft, and maybe give to Stein.

WUE #8

Soehren: Not sure if we need to proceed until we hear from an expert panel or focus group.

Kathy: What's the issue? If a subset of another issue, needs to be reflected on matrix. Do we include water balance studies? Its own issue, dealt with directly.

Steve: How much, from whom? What are multiple benefits of found water?

Carolyn: Can we reframe issue and bring back.

Steve: Ag water caucus -- putting together paper by June 8 or so, may be available for BDAC, stating no real environmental WUE program fleshed out.

Soehren: just had a couple of public workshops. Bureau and Service (USFWS or NMFS??) taking lead.

Steve: Ag saying if it applies to us, then should apply to enviros too.

Soehren: It does.

Steve: Mike Heaton could help. Need a CALFED water use analysis -- all activities in the Program.

TIME: Environmental WUE program -- same time frame as urban and ag -- by Final Draft.

Steve: it's an issue with water users.

Penny: Should be by Revised draft.

Wendy: Any other issues should be sent to Wendy, Michael Fainter, or the program manager. Will schedule those issues for future meetings.

Storage Issues - Mark Cowin

Storage #1

Mark: What's the issue - seems more related to assurances.

Kathy: Does any agency want to take this on?

Penny: Keep in matrix as placeholder.

Storage #2

Penny: See more as financing issue.

ACTION: Moved to finance.

Storage #3

Wendy: The Environmental Team has to respond to this.

Storage #4

Mark: Time = by Final, but ongoing into Phase III.

Patrick: Workplan doesn't refer to environmental analysis, although that's addressed in the issue.

Kathy: Want reframed as an issue. Include env analysis in workplan.

Earl: Sounds more like a concern than issue.

Mark: Delta "and environmental" from issue?

Wendy: Yes. If not adequately addressed later, can add that as a new issue.

Storage #5

Kathy: Take out.

Storage #6

Carolyn: There are at least two issues here.

Mark: Move op concerns to time value of water (#7). Site-specific stuff - we're proceeding with the screening process laid out last year. Plan to proceed with initial screening as laid out at this time.

Carolyn: There hasn't been environmental screening in Phase II. We're proposed there be environmental screening.

Patrick: Agreed.

Carolyn: We're prepared to draft criteria.

Kathy: Sounds time consuming and controversial, but we should do. As you draft criteria, need for scientific explanation will be very high. No way to get done by PA with consensus.

Carolyn: Wouldn't be complete, but could at least screen out some things.

Wendy: Discuss in more detail subsequently, how to do additional work. High priority at next week's meeting.

Julie Tupper: Is there a way to simplify, i.e., categorize? Address in appendix so people know we've responded.

Frank Piccola: Be careful re screening out - categorizing is better (as far as 404 is concerned).

Patrick: Interagency storage screening committee hasn't met since October.

Storage #7

Wendy: Mark mentioned adding operational to this issue (from #6)

Steve: Component of time value, but also placement value.

Mark: Net benefit - pretty vague. Need group like DEFPT to tell us what that means.

Steve: Where it's stored - those relative values.

Mark: Think that'll come out in reservoir screens.

Steve: It's the yield from storage, not just size.

Patrick: Phase II report - our comments on time value were mischaracterized. Does it really only apply to the environment? Is there a way to apply time value to other users?

Mark: Plays into economic evaluation we're doing. Will be in development for a long time.

Patrick: Can we make the same kind of assumption regarding other users that we make re environmental value? Does time value apply to everyone?

Earl: Going on into Phase III - critical issue is price of power. Implementation Report needs to accurately address what will be looked at in Phase III. Probability and frequency of impacts.

Wendy: Can that be done in project-specific level? Not sure we can get there. Can this be done in implementation?

Earl: Maybe, but concerned we'll be in a corner and unable to change direction.

Kathy: Speculation re future. This won't provide the level of detail you want.

Earl: Need to know if it's in jeopardy. Customers leaning really hard on us.

Penny: Do we need this as a separate issue?

Mark: YES.

Storage #8

Penny: Legitimacy of Bulletin 160 assumptions.

Steve: Plus CALFED's role - not to solve water supply problems of state. What is CALFED's role?

Penny: Two parts to this issue. What are CALFED's water supply objectives as well as assumptions in modeling.

Wendy: Can we quantify our objectives? Is Bulletin 160 a credible source for assumptions.

Carolyn: I would have said water supply reliability.

Wendy: Re quantifying - 404. Until we define where we need to go, we can't measure if we've met project purposes.

Mark: Can't separate water supply from rest of Program objectives. Some will be addressed in economic evaluation.

Julie: Is CALFED bringing in population growth?

Wendy: Let's put this on the agenda for further discussion.

Storage: New Issues

Patrick: Time value of water to yield - are we going to look at it?

Mark: Economic models - can add environmental impacts under those scenarios.

Penny: How do we address that in the workplan?

Dale: The subject of issue #8 will capture it.

Earl: Earl read an issue from his laptop screen - Michael Fainter typed into his laptop.
Issue framed? OK

Mark: What is CALFED's role in groundwater conjunctive use programs?

Conveyance Issues - Mark Cowin

Conveyance #1

Eliminated.

Conveyance #2

Frank W: What's the significance of dropping this?

Wendy: We still have to respond to comments and questions. It just wouldn't be handled by ART.

Eliminate? YES

Conveyance #3

Patrick: What's the real issue? Do people not believe the modeling, or do they just not like the results?

Steve: Workplan should propose solutions.

Carolyn: Some information missing on toxicants.

Penny: Are we hung up on the word modeling? There's other ongoing work.

Mark: How we might change operational policies.

Penny: Adding modeling and discussion efforts. Don't need all 3 boxes checked.

Mark: By August, we'll have cost estimates. Don't expect to be able to do a lot of modeling of operational plans by August.

Tom: Why focus on north of Delta?

Mark: Strike last sentence.

Patrick: (restating what he heard) In-Delta water quality degradation. Some things we need to know about which we don't yet know. Not sure we should identify if impacts are acceptable - in this group. Might want to separate them. (1) Concern over nature of results so far - modeling shows results are bad. (2) Need for additional information on unknowns. Address the two separately in workplan.

Kathy: Impacts associated with particular conveyance...

Mark: Haven't thoroughly defined op policy for Alternative 3. Using proposed policy.

Wendy: Determining which op and operational considerations should be added to middle sentence. Delete 1st sentence.

Time = PA

Kathy: Leave checks in all applicable boxes so it frames workplan.

Penny: Needs to be distinguished.

Mark: Can do that in Workplan section.

Patrick: Should be Phase III process slot.

Julie: Need something in PA for consensus.

Mark: Need to better display what we've already done.

Steve: Is there a critical task for PA?

Penny: Yes, we need a discrete process by PA.

Steve: Re Carolyn's issue, are there selenium data gaps?

Wendy: We need to discuss the work that needs to be done at a future meeting.

PA box

Longer-term process

Delete third sentence too.

Tom: Propose operational processes as separate issues, fit more than one issue.

Mark: Combine 3 and 4

Tom: Two issues. One on operational alternatives, second on effects. Rephrasing of 3 and 4. Have all possible ranges of operational alternatives been considered?

Mark: Yes. We'll do more work on operational. These are the parameters we'll be looking at.

ACTION: Mark to recraft 3 and 4 issues statements and bring back to group.

Conveyance #5

Eliminated.

Conveyance #6

Eliminated.

Conveyance #7

Eliminated.

Dale: Any additional issues under conveyance?

Steve: Impacts relative to development of water transfer market and of isolated conveyance facility.

Penny: ...on page 2 of water transfer as last issue.

Gary Stern: sub-Delta ... water surface elevation. Have potential to eliminate barriers.

Frank W: Want to frame issue. The EIS/R doesn't adequately describe how in-Delta ag users could be served by alternative means in Alternative 3 to address reduced water quality in Delta associated with Alternative 3.

PA

Wendy: rebuttal to common pool. Discuss workplan efforts at future meeting.

Frank W: EIS needs to explain how levee common pool will be implemented regardless of which alternative is chosen.

Water Transfers Issues - Greg Young

Transfer #1

Patrick: What's the issue?

Penny: Last sentence.

Patrick: Is that in question format?

Penny: We need a process.

Carolyn: There may be heightened water transfer activity. Those will have impacts that should be in EIS.

Patrick: What should be CALFED's role in water transfers clearinghouse? Should we be in it?

Penny: We don't have a water transfer program yet.

Kathy: Give people a heads up that water transfer is happening in area. Third parties may not be aware. Delete #1 after reviewing others.

Greg: Local socio-economic in #1.

Dale: Reword #1 to capture that.

Kathy: Call it socio-economic and have third party in text.

ACTION: Greg is to recharacterize #1.

Kathy: Clearinghouse relates to third parties. Leave title third party. A separate subgroup for socio-economic.

Walt: Subsidence damaged infrastructure. Do we try to be all-inclusive?

Greg: Desire to set up process, not spell everything out.

ACTION: Greg to recraft as an agenda item for another meeting.

Penny: Writing issue paper for WUE. One common program (WUE) hinging on another (Transfers) that isn't developed.

_____: Does knowing the hinge is there satisfy, or do you need to know the details on the other side of hinge, in order to make a decision?

Penny: Will characterize in paper on WUE to recognize environmental discomfort with WUE program due to lack of water transfer program.

Greg: By Final, we'll have policy recommendations or establish a process.

Transfer #2

Penny: Take out. This is existing law.

Kathy: What does the clearinghouse do?

Greg: Ten things developed in Water Transfer Work Group.

Item for another meeting.

Transfer #3

Penny: Omit reference to current law.

Patrick: Is this an issue, and how is it to be resolved?

Greg: I don't think any of these are disagreements, but things that need to be handled.

Carolyn: We have processes we'd like to incorporate.

Wendy: Any issues not captured here need to be brought up here today - that's the critical role of the ART.

Penny: We need to track so we can elevate to Management Team when necessary. See matrix as a task list.

Steve: Linkage between Water Transfer and Conveyance alternative. Range of isolated facility -- capacity to transfer water - needs to be addressed in EIS - Alternatives 1 and 2.

Penny: Or, if transfer done, at whose expense?

Steve: Most of this can come off table - covered in legislation.

Greg: Hoping not all will need legislation.

Transfer #4

??

Transfer #5

Issue framed OK.

Transfer #6

Issue framed OK.

Transfer #7

Carolyn: New issue. Issue is stated accurately. EPA wants CALFED to drop assumption that only real water can be transferred. Transferrable water can include more than real water.

ACTION: Issue to be elevated. Carolyn will be lead on issue paper.

Carolyn: OK to keep as separate issue with caveat that there's another issue re definition of transferrable water.

- Both get elevated.

Wendy: Need draft papers by next Wednesday's meeting. Carolyn will be lead and contact Greg Young.

Transfer #8

Add DFG and USFWS to workplan efforts. Also SWRCB, NMFS.

Transfer #9

Sub-issue of #7

Greg to discuss with DWR and USEPA to clarify.

Refill criteria - policy issue to elevate to Management Team.

Penny: Agree. Can help with other areas.

Kathy to be lead on issue paper.

Transfer #10

Gary wants to be on working team.

Patrick: Probably lots of regulatory agencies do.

Greg: State Board.

Transfer #11

Gary: Does this include Four Pumps?

Greg: Not that closely defined. Can we make any progress in their answer?

Carolyn: Is this technical or policy?

Kathy: Policy. Larger or different group.

ACTION: Elevate to Policy Group. Kathy is lead on issue paper by next Wednesday.

Greg: Can the Bureau help Kathy?

Penny: me.

Transfer #12

Transfer #13

Other Transfer Issues

Carolyn: Workplan process

Wendy: We can discuss at water transfer ART meeting.

Julie: Recreational pool. Yuba County...reservoir on USFS land. They have large transfers and deplete recreational pool, resulting in loss of funds.

Penny: Also, you have requirement to operate the recreational pool. When transfers happen, agency is unable to fulfill a mandate. More than third party issue - it's a legal issue.

Issue: Should transfers be limited by reservoir recreational pool requirements?

Patrick: What is CALFED's role in Water Transfers?

Cross-Delta conveyance - USFWS doesn't feel CALFED should be in cross-Delta conveyance, unless it's multi-purpose.

ACTION: Patrick to write up paper by Wednesday.

Penny: Sounds like a policy call.

Earl: New Melones - power pool requirements

Implementation Planning Issues - Stein Buer

Implementation #1

Tom: ... negotiations.

Stein: Not aware of negotiations.

Kathy: Accord expires at end of 1998 - policy issue. Larger issue re standards for implementation of first phase.

Gary: Working with DWR and The Reclamation Board re steelhead.

Penny: "Early implementation" - same term as Ecosystem Restoration Category III. Can you change it to "Stage 1"?

Carolyn: Tom Hagler will participate.

Issue framed OK

Final is OK

Patrick: We can throw options out to Management Team and Policy Group to sort through or submit proposals to them with examples.

Start with examples and build on it.

Workplan:

CALFED staff drafts initial proposal. With Patrick, Hagler, Penny or other USBR rep, Carolyn, Gary, Wernette, Tom (Board).

Penny: Criteria operating projects to should be separate piece. But don't know how that fits into State Board standards. How do Board standards, this, and implementation strategy all fit together?

Kathy: What to do with existing standards we've been extending. Just delete the title that refers to Accord.

Tom: Need decision if it's stage 1.

Implementation #2

Issue OK (but call it Stage 1)

Need an ART meeting on this.

Patrick: Use group from previous task. #1 and #2 are related.

Stein: What are we doing in Stage 1? My assumption - agencies want action list to select PA. Needs to be concurrence on elements. Different level of detail for PA and Final.

Lowrie: "equitable and practical" - everyone together.

Wendy: Let's do workplan at another meeting and concentrate on issues.

Patrick: Let's work on it now. Management Team identified team to work on this. Stage 1 - people think we'll be able to start because specific actions outlined in final. Text should say "more specific" rather than "specific."

Implementation #3

Stein: Focused on Alternative 3 because it's the most challenging re assurances. Need to focus on most important.

Issue framed OK.

Penny: Does this definition of linkage include ERPP and levees? Program linkage as opposed to integration.

Stein: What I meant is legal or physical that create constraint.

Implementation #4

Will we sunset or will a policy group and small staff continue? Will all stage 1 actions and Category III go through? There are several questions.

Penny: Need decision by Final so we can be ready to go.

Rick B: now.

Kathy: Needs to be addressed before Final in more fleshed out way - Revised Draft. Stakeholders are interested.

Penny: Hard to select structure until we know what will be implemented.

For both #4 and #5.

Final = OK

Lowrie: Elevate at least part of this.

Stein: Should staff do straw proposal?

Penny: that's premature. Until stage 1 is defined, we can't develop organizational structure.

Patrick: They can deal with these conceptually. It's not entirely abstract.

Kathy: Needs to be discussed in Revised Draft at some level.

Dick: Re ERPP, staff define/describe staffing needs/organizational aspects for implementing ERPP. Haven't resolved whether the entity is independent, or existing CALFED agencies, or distributed respectively. Policy Group must decide what sign to put on the door.

ACTION: Lowrie to draft paper by next Wednesday, with Stein.

Implementation #5

Combine with #4

New Implementation #6

Stein: Subset of linkage issue #3, process question. 20 or 30 linkages can be identified. Tom Hagler brought up at Management Team. We need process for broad stakeholder support to get EPA's buy off of Preferred Alternative.

Issue framed OK

By PA, more specifics by Final.

Process.

Same workplan as #3

New Implementation #7

(formerly Conveyance #2)

Stein: Major conveyance modifications require assurances. Rob Cooke idea - transfer tax for levee improvements and tie that into public bond language.

Workplan: Should be Implementation, not Assurances Work Group.

PA, more by Final

Process

New Implementation #8

(formerly Conveyance #5)

Same issue?

Change workplan. Should be Implementation, not Policy.

New Implementation #9
(formerly Conveyance #6)

Workplan - delete old text, merge with new Implementation #7

New Implementation #10
(formerly Conveyance #7)

(Same changes as previous 3)

Patrick: Don't lump with stage 1 actions.

Penny: Triggers, not linkages.

Patrick: This is first stage.

Stein: No, this is second or third stage.

Penny: How do you define triggers.

Stein: Put in linkage.

New Implementation #11
(formerly Storage #5)

Treat same as New Implementation #10, above.

New Issues

Penny: Where do you put program component integration?

Stein: Stage 1 action list should get enough review.

Frank W: inadequate description of roles agencies play. Some have current mandates they can't delegate.

(Similar to recreational pool issue of USFS.)

Frank W: Need to recognize that some agencies are implementing mandated responsibilities.

Patrick: On and off ramp. Not a good analogy. Trigger is better.

Penny: Nature of decision.

Stein: Still working on text, but deleting on and off ramp.

Issue: Patrick: no issue, just don't use highway metaphors.

Tom: Hearings. When CALFED makes decision, we're stuck with it.

Issue Paper Content

- State Issue
- Action Item: What we want from Management Team
- Background: Different perspectives of various interest groups
- Options for Resolving Issue

June 11:

1. Outlying issues on main document.
2. Pass out papers.
3. Storage and Conveyance if time allows.

June 16:

1. ERP
2. Discuss papers

To-Do List:

Implementation

Transfers

Finance

Penny: Issue papers don't need recommendations or have consensus. Pass out draft on June 11, mark-ups by June 16

Rick B: Discuss with your agency. Identify if a stakeholder issue (rather than agency).